

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed 11/09/2007. Reconsideration in light of the amendments and remarks made herein is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

7. The Examiner rejects claims 1 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Shabtay et al. (U.S. Patent 6,895,441).

Applicant has amended these independent claims to include subject matter the Examiner indicated as being allowable as described below.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Shabtay.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

10. The Examiner rejects claims 2-6 and 25-29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shabtay et al. (U.S. Patent 6,895,441) in view of admitted prior art of Applicant.

Applicant relies on the patentability of the claims from which these claims depend to traverse the rejection without prejudice to any further basis for patentability of these claims based on the additional elements recited.

19. The Examiner rejects claims 7 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shabtay et al. (U.S. Patent 6,895,441) in view of Rom et al, U.S. Patent Application 2003/0236854).

Applicant relies on the patentability of the claims from which these claims depend to traverse the rejection without prejudice to any further basis for patentability of these claims based on the additional elements recited.

Allowable Subject Matter

24. Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter. The Examiner objects to claims 8 and 31 as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but indicates that the claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 24 to include all of the limitations of dependent claims 8 and 31 and any intervening dependent claims and cancelled claims 8 and 31. Claims 7 and 30 have been cancelled as inconsistent with claims 1 and 24 as amended. Applicant respectfully requests that independent claims 1 and 24 and claims 2-6 and 25-29 that depend therefrom be allowed.
26. Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's allowance of claims 9-17, 18-23, 32-40, and 41-46.

Conclusion

Applicant reserves all rights with respect to the applicability of the doctrine of equivalents. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 01/03/2008

By /James Henry/

James Henry
Reg. No. 41,064
Tel.: (714) 557-3800 (Pacific Coast)